



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/461,110	12/14/1999	STAFFAN JOHANSSON	040010-585	3348
27045	7590	10/05/2005	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11 PLANO, TX 75024			CHOJACKI, MELLISSA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/461,110	JOHANSSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Melissa M. Chojnacki	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 17-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 17-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on July 31 2005, no claims have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 17-32 are still presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 17-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frangione et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,189) in view of Fox (U.S. Patent No. 5,765,172).

As to claim 17, Frangione et al. teaches in a wireless telecommunications system, a method of synchronizing configuring data, which is utilized for proper operation of a base station, and is stored in a base station database with corresponding configuring data stored in one or more source units each unit having a database for storing configuring data (See abstract; column 1, lines 14-27; column 3, lines 63-67; column 4, lines 1-9; column 6, lines 51-67; column 7, lines 1-15), the base station database and the source unit databases each being arranged in a single data group or a plurality of data groups within each database (See column 4, lines 30-31; column 6, lines 51-67; column 7, lines 1-15), the method comprising the steps of: monitoring all base station data groups (See column 2, lines 26-48).

Frangione et al. does not teach calculating a reference checksum for each of the data groups in the base station database and the source unit database, wherein the data groups in the base station database correspond with the data groups in the one or more source units; comparing a calculated checksum of each data group in the base station database to the reference checksum of each corresponding data group in the one or more source units; and requesting a copy of the base station data group for which a mismatch is found, to be downloaded to the base station database from the corresponding one or more source units upon detecting a mismatch between the corresponding one or more source units data group's reference checksum and the corresponding calculated checksum.

Fox teaches a system and method for verifying integrity of replication databases (See abstract), in which he teaches calculating a reference checksum for each of the data groups in the base station database and the source unit database, wherein the data groups in the base station database correspond with the data groups in the one or more source units (See Fig. 8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-6); comparing a calculated checksum of each data group in the base station database to the reference checksum of each corresponding data group in the one or more source units (See Fig. 8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-6); and requesting a copy of the base station data group for which a mismatch is found, to be downloaded to the base station database from the corresponding one or more source units upon detecting a mismatch between the corresponding one or more source units data group's reference checksum

and the corresponding calculated checksum (See abstract; column 5, lines 35-44; column 7, lines 65-67; column 8, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Frangione et al., to include calculating a reference checksum for each of the data groups in the base station database and the source unit database, wherein the data groups in the base station database correspond with the data groups in the one or more source units; comparing a calculated checksum of each data group in the base station database to the reference checksum of each corresponding data group in the one or more source units; and requesting a copy of the base station data group for which a mismatch is found, to be downloaded to the base station database from the corresponding one or more source units upon detecting a mismatch between the corresponding one or more source units data group's reference checksum and the corresponding calculated checksum.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Frangione et al., by the teachings of Fox because calculating a reference checksum for each of the data groups in the base station database and the source unit database, wherein the data groups in the base station database correspond with the data groups in the one or more source units; comparing a calculated checksum of each data group in the base station database to the reference checksum of each corresponding data group in the one or more source units; and requesting a copy of the base station data group for which a mismatch is found, to be downloaded to the base station database from the corresponding one or

more source units upon detecting a mismatch between the corresponding one or more source units data group's reference checksum and the corresponding calculated checksum would prevent replicated distributed databases from beginning to diverge, that is, no longer contain identical data (See Fox, column 1, lines 45-57).

As to claims 18 and 26, Frangione et al., teaches subsequent to the step of calculating reference checksums, downloading corresponding one or more source units data group reference checksums to the base station, wherein the reference checksum in each data group in the corresponding one or more source units database is calculated using the content of the corresponding one or more source units configuring data; means for downloading the corresponding one or more source units data group reference checksums to the base station, wherein the reference checksum in each data group in the corresponding one or more source units database are calculated using the content of corresponding one or more source units configuring data (See Frangione et al. column 9, lines 4-23; also see Fox, Fig. 5-8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-35; column 5, lines 30-44).

As to claims 19 and 27, Frangione et al., teaches wherein the step of comparing the corresponding one or more source units data group reference checksums to corresponding calculated base station data group checksums is initiated upon detecting operation disturbances in the base station; means for initiating comparison of the corresponding one or more source units data group reference checksums to the

corresponding calculated base station data group checksums upon date sting operation disturbances in the base station (See Frangione et al., column 9, lines 4-23; also see Fox, Fig. 5-8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-35; column 5, lines 30-44).

As to claims 20 and 28, Frangione et al., teaches wherein the step of comparing corresponding one or more source units data group reference checksums to the corresponding calculated base station data group checksums further comprises repeating the comparison on a regular basis; means for repeating the comparison of the corresponding one or more source units data group reference checksums to the corresponding calculated base station data group checksums on a regular basis (See Frangione et al., column 9, lines 4-23; also see Fox, Fig. 5-8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-35; column 5, lines 30-44).

As to claims 21 and 29, Frangione et al., teaches repeating the comparison on a regular basis having a predetermined times interval between each comparison; wherein the means for repeating the comparison of the one or more source units data group reference checksums further comprises means for repeating the comparison on a regular basis having a predetermined time interval between each comparison (See Frangione et al., column 9, lines 4-23; also see Fox, Fig. 5-8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-35; column 5, lines 30-44).

As to claims 22 and 30, Frangione et al., teaches performing the comparison for each data group in the base station database, wherein an individual time interval between comparisons is predetermined for each data group; means for performing the comparison for each data group in the base station database, wherein an individual time interval between comparisons is predetermined for each data group (See Frangione et al. column 9, lines 4-23; column 10, lines 42-58; also see Fox, Fig. 5-8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-35; column 5, lines 30-44).

As to claims 23 and 31, Frangione et al., teaches performing checksum calculations of the configuring data for each base station data group; and comparing the calculated checksums to the reference checksums received from the corresponding one or more source units; means for performing checksum calculations of the configuring data for each base station data group; and means for comparing the calculated checksums to the corresponding one or more source units data group reference checksums received from the corresponding one or more source units (See Frangione et al. column 9, lines 4-23; also see Fox, Fig. 5-8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-35; column 5, lines 30-44).

As to claims 24 and 32, Frangione et al., teaches wherein the base station data groups are classified according to the need for the content of each data group, wherein the configuring data in a data group classified as more urgent is downloaded to the base station prior to downloading configuring data in a data group classified as less

urgent and copies of the corresponding one or more source units configuring data for each data group are downloaded as needed in order according to the classification of the data group, wherein a source unit comprises a mobile switching center (MSC); means for classifying the base station data groups, wherein the base station data groups are classified according to the need of the content of each data group, wherein the configuring data in a data group classified as more urgent is downloaded to the base station prior to downloading configuring data in a data group classified as less urgent and copies of the corresponding one or more source units configuring data for each data group are downloaded as needed in order according to the classification of the data group, wherein a source unit comprises a mobile switching center (MSC) (See Frangione et al., column 9, lines 4-23; also see Fox, Fig. 5-8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-35; column 5, lines 30-44).

As to claim 25, Frangione et al. teaches a system for synchronizing configuring data stored in a base station database with corresponding configuring data stored in a corresponding one or more source units database (See abstract; column 1, lines 14-27; column 3, lines 63-67; column 4, lines 1-9; column 6, lines 51-67; column 7, lines 1-15), the base station database and the corresponding one or more source units database each being arranged in a data group or a plurality of data groups within each database (See column 4, lines 30-31; column 6, lines 51-67; column 7, lines 1-15), the system comprising:
means for monitoring all base station data groups (See column 2, lines 26-48).

Frangione et al., does not teach means for calculating reference checksum for each of the data groups in the base station database and the corresponding one or more source units database; comparison means for comparing a calculated checksum of each data group in the base station database to the reference checksum of each corresponding data group in the corresponding one or more source units database; and means for requesting a copy of the corresponding one or more source units data group for which a mismatch is found, to be downloaded to the base station database upon detecting a mismatch between a data group's reference checksum and the corresponding calculated checksum.

Fox teaches a system and method for verifying integrity of replicated databases (See abstract), in which he teaches means for calculating reference checksum for each of the data groups in the base station database and the corresponding one or more source units database (See Fig. 8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-6); comparison means for comparing a calculated checksum of each data group in the base station database to the reference checksum of each corresponding data group in the corresponding one or more source units database (See Fig. 8; column 1, lines 65-67; column 2, lines 1-6); and means for requesting a copy of the corresponding one or more source units data group for which a mismatch is found, to be downloaded to the base station database upon detecting a mismatch between a data group's reference checksum and the corresponding calculated checksum (See abstract; column 5, lines 35-44; column 7, lines 65-67; column 8, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Frangione et al., to include comparison means for comparing a calculated checksum of each data group in the base station database to the reference checksum of each corresponding data group in the corresponding one or more source units database; and means for requesting a copy of the corresponding one or more source units data group for which a mismatch is found, to be downloaded to the base station database upon detecting a mismatch between a data group's reference checksum and the corresponding calculated checksum.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Frangione et al., by the teachings of Fox because comparison means for comparing a calculated checksum of each data group in the base station database to the reference checksum of each corresponding data group in the corresponding one or more source units database; and means for requesting a copy of the corresponding one or more source units data group for which a mismatch is found, to be downloaded to the base station database upon detecting a mismatch between a data group's reference checksum and the corresponding calculated checksum would prevent replicated distributed databases from beginning to diverge, that is, no longer contain identical data (See Fox, column 1, lines 45-57).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on July 31 2005, with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 29, 2005
Mmc



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER